



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

02/082,328 06/24/93 HIGHT

7 7823003

EXAMINER

WHITMAN, Y

51M1.1017

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

PENNIE & EDMONDS  
1155 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2711

13

2103

DATE MAILED:

10/17/95

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☐ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on electron 6/14/95 ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 0 month(s), 30 days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☐ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
- ☐

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-205 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.

4. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are rejected.

5. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.

6. ☒ Claims 1-205 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received  
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 2103

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: ~~the~~

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently,

- a) Figures 1, 7, 15 drawn to a modular electronic system referred to claims 1-12, 13, 18, 22, 28, 60, 68, 102-103, 107, 139-142, 144, 148.
- b) Figure 2 drawn to a transmission line referred to claims 14, 26-27, 30-35, 69 etc.
- c) Figure 3 drawn to a conductive interconnection referred to claims 9, 36, 39, 40 etc.
- d) Figure 4 drawn to a MCM construction system.
- e) Figure 5 drawn to a wave forms for digital signal system.
- f) Figure 6 drawn to a wave forms for digital signal system.
- g) Figure 8 drawn to a non-planar modular electronic system.
- h) Figures 9-10 drawn to a large-scale modular system.
- i) Figures 11-12 drawn to a misalignment in a capacitor coupled system.
- j) Figures 13-14 drawn to a superconducting electronic device.
- k) Figure 16a drawn to a modular electronic system coupled to a backplane.
- l) Figures 18A-C drawn to a step of mcm assembly.

- m) Figure 19, drawn to a capacitance signal path including means for adjusting overall gain.
- n) Figure 20A-B drawn to an application specific module system (ASM).
- o) Figure 21 drawn to a cable interface coupling techniques.
- p) Figure 22, drawn to an inter-chip and infra-chip capacitive signal.
- q) Figure 23A-B, drawn to a testing modules in a wafer scale modular system.
- r) Figures 25-28 drawn to a fabrication of wafer-scale modules.
- s) Figure 29 drawn to a design cycle for a modular system.
- t) Figures 30-31, 35-37 drawn to a transmitter and receiver signal path system.
- u) Figures 32-34 drawn to a switching means of electrical system.
- v) Figures 38a-b drawn to an non conductive signalling in parallel and perpendicular coupled transmission lines.

2. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, there are no generic claims.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Art Unit 2103

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).


Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identity such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

3. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Young Whang at telephone number (703) 308-1763.



LEO P. PICARD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 213

 Whang/dc  
October 02, 1995